



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/213,131	12/15/1998	ERIC C. ANDERSON	1104-069	7384
27820	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C. P.O. BOX 1287 CARY, NC 27512			AGGARWAL, YOGESH K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2615	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/213,131

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON, ERIC C.

Examiner

Yogesh K. Aggarwal

Art Unit

2615

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 7-9, 11-18 and 20-22.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2615

Examiner's response:

1. Applicant argues with regards to claim 7 that the Patent Office provides no analysis as to why the scanner of Parulski would be modified to a digital camera nor has the Patent office provided any evidence to support the implied modification. Thus, the modification is improper. Even if the Patent Office had advanced some evidence to support the implicit modifications this modification remains non-obvious because the modification renders Parulski unsuitable for its intended purpose of copying analog film into a digital file. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Parulski clearly teaches photographic images, such as a set of images of a film strip 10, are scanned by a high resolution opto-electronic film scanner 12. Scanner 12 **outputs digitally encoded data (e.g. a 3072.times.2048 pixel matrix)** representative of the internal electronic scanning of a **high resolution image sensing array** onto which a respective photographic image frame of film strip is projected. This **digitally encoded data, or 'digitized' image**, is coupled in the form of an imaging pixel array-representative bit map (col. 4 lines 32-45). Therefore the scanner comprises at least an image sensing array (e.g. CCD) and an A/D circuit, which are the essential components of a digital camera. Even the applicant's specification shows a digital camera (figure 3) having an image sensor and an A/D converter. Thus both the digital scanner and digital camera are equivalent circuits. Furthermore, Parulski also teaches that in general, the invention may be incorporated in any digitized image processing system (col. 4 lines 30-31), which includes any kind of a digital circuit even a digital camera. Therefore the modification suggested by Patent Office is proper. It is not clear why applicant thinks that it would render Parulski unsuitable for its intended purpose of copying analog film into a digital file because the digital camera can be used for doing the exact same function. The invention described in Parulski

Art Unit: 2615

does not necessarily need a digital scanner or a digital camera but any digitized image processing system.



TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER